



GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

2013 ANNUAL REPORT

Threshold Review Period 7/1/11 to 6/30/12

April 25, 2013

*Approved by the Planning Commission (Resolution No. PCM 12-41) and
City Council (Resolution No. 2012-___) on April 25, 2013*

GMOC Members

Armida Torres, Chair (Business)
Carl Harry, Vice Chair (Development)
David Danciu (Southwest)
Eric Mosolgo (Environmental)
Javier Rosales (Northeast)
Leslie Bunker (Education)
Mark Liuag (Planning Commission Representative)
Russ Hall, Vice Chair (Center City)
Zaneta Encarnacion (Southeast)

City Staff

Kimberly Vander Bie – Growth Management Coordinator
Patricia Salvacion and Pat Laughlin – Management Assistants
Ed Batchelder – Advance Planning Manager

City of Chula Vista
Development Services Department
276 Fourth Avenue
Chula Vista, CA 91910
(619) 691-5101

www.chulavistaca.gov

GMOC Chair Cover Memo

DATE: April 25, 2013

TO: The Honorable Mayor and City Council
Members of the Planning Commission
City of Chula Vista

FROM: Armida Torres, Chair
Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

SUBJECT: Executive Summary - 2013 GMOC Annual Report

The GMOC appreciates the time and expertise given by the staff of various City departments, as well as the school districts, water districts, and the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) in helping us complete this year's annual report. The written and verbal reports presented to the GMOC demonstrate the commitment of these dedicated professionals to serving the citizens of Chula Vista. Special thanks to Kim Vander Bie, Pat Laughlin and Patricia Salvacion who provided direct staff support to the Commission.

There were seven quality of life threshold standards that the GMOC found to be in compliance:

- Air Quality
- Drainage
- Fiscal
- Parks and Recreation
- Schools
- Sewer
- Water

The following four quality of life threshold standards were found to be out of compliance:

- Fire
- Libraries
- Police (Priority 1 and 2)
- Traffic

The details of each of the above are outlined in the attached report. The GMOC would like to highlight a few items of special interest.

Fire – For the second consecutive year, response times have fallen below the threshold standard. In last year's report, the Fire Department identified the problem as increased turnout times. In this report, an increased call volume of 1,493 calls (10% medical and 24% fire), with no increase in staffing and resources, was reported as a hindrance. Regarding the Fire Facilities Master Plan, there does not appear to be much progress made since last year when the GMOC recommended expeditious completion of public information meetings and scheduling for Council consideration.

Libraries - For the ninth consecutive year, Libraries is non-compliant with the threshold standard, due to inadequate PFDIF funds to construct additional square footage. Therefore, once again, the GMOC stresses the importance of Council adopting an updated Libraries Facilities Master Plan that identifies interim and long-term solutions to the current square footage deficit.

Police - For the first time since 2004, the Priority 1 threshold standard was non-compliant; calls responded to within 7 minutes dropped by more than 6%. The Police Department attributed this shortfall to low staffing in the Community Patrol Division and noted that additional officers are being hired. The Police Priority 2 threshold standard was also, for the 15th year in a row, non-compliant. The Police Department cited low staffing for this deficiency, as well. However, part of the problem, as noted in previous GMOC annual reports, is that the current Priority 2 threshold standard has some flaws that will be modified through the Top-to-Bottom process. Overall, the GMOC is concerned that the trend for both Priority 1 and 2 is headed in the wrong direction and will continue to monitor these closely in future reports.

Traffic – This year, two signalized arterial segments were found to be non-compliant (northbound Heritage Road between Olympic Parkway and Telegraph Canyon Road, and southbound Otay Lakes Road between H St. and Telegraph Canyon Rd. The GMOC has serious concerns surrounding the chronic non-compliance of the Traffic threshold standard and the delay in constructing Heritage Road to Main Street. While it is within the GMOC's purview to request that City Council hold a public hearing to consider a moratorium on tentative maps or building permits, due to non-compliant traffic conditions, we are choosing a different course of action. We are asking that the City conduct a public workshop to discuss the Traffic issues as they stand today, as well as forecasted conditions and roadway improvement plans. This workshop would highly informative and beneficial to the public in understanding the planning and expansion of the circulation system, and ongoing threshold compliance conditions.

Economic challenges have affected the City across the board, and it is very apparent to the GMOC that fiscal trials have impacted the non-compliant threshold standards mentioned above. As the economy recovers, however, the GMOC anticipates that Police and Fire response times and Traffic's level of service will improve. We will be watching closely.

Table of Contents

GMOC CHAIR COVER MEMO	1-2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
1.0 INTRODUCTION	4-5
1.1 Threshold Standards	4
1.2 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)	4
1.3 GMOC 2013 Annual Review Process	5
1.4 Growth Forecast	5
1.5 Report Organization	5
2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY	6
3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS	7-25
3.1 Libraries.....	7-8
3.1.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard	7-8
3.2 Police	8-11
3.2.1 Non-Compliant Priority 1 Threshold Standard	9-10
3.2.2 Non-Compliant Priority 2 Threshold Standard	10-11
3.3 Traffic	11-14
3.3.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard	11-13
3.3.2 Underutilization of SR-125	13
3.3.3 Construction of Heritage Road	13-14
3.4 Fire and Emergency Services.....	14-16
3.4.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard	15-16
3.4.2 Fire Facilities Master Plan	16
3.5 Parks and Recreation.....	16-18
3.5.1 Potential Non-Compliant Threshold Standard	16-17
3.5.2 Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan	17
3.5.3 Revenue Generating Capital Improvements	17-18
3.6 Fiscal	18-19
3.6.1 PFDIF Debt Service	18-19
3.7 Drainage	18-19
3.7.1 Maintenance of Existing Drainage Channels	19-20
3.8 Schools.....	20-21
3.8.1 School Districts Updates	20-21
3.9 Sewer.....	20-21
3.9.1 Long-Term Treatment Capacity	22
3.10 Air Quality	22-23
3.10.1 Threshold Compliance	23
3.11 Water	23-25
3.11.1 Meeting Water Demands	24-25
4.0 APPENDICES	25
4.1 Appendix A – Growth Forecast	
4.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires	

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Threshold Standards

In November 1987, the Chula Vista City Council adopted the Threshold Standards Policy, establishing threshold standards, or “quality-of-life” indicators, for eleven public facility and service topics, including: Air Quality, Drainage, Fire and Emergency Services, Fiscal, Libraries, Parks and Recreation, Police, Schools, Sewer, Traffic and Water. The Policy addresses each indicator in terms of a goal, objective(s), threshold standard(s), and implementation measures. Adherence to the threshold standards is intended to preserve and enhance the quality of life and environment of Chula Vista residents, as growth occurs.

1.2 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

The 1987 Threshold Standards Policy also established the creation of the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC), a body appointed by City Council to provide an independent, annual review of threshold standards compliance. The GMOC is composed of nine members who represent each of the city’s four major geographic areas; a cross-section of interests, including education, environment, business, and development; and a member of the Planning Commission. All of these citizens are volunteers and this report could not have been written without the time and effort that they have put into it.

The GMOC welcomed two new commissioners last fall, Javier Rosales (Northeast) and Leslie Bunker (Education), who joined Armida Torres (Business); Carl Harry (Development); David Danciu (Southwest); Mark Liuag (Planning Commission); and Russ Hall (Northwest). Two remaining vacancies were filled last month with Eric Mosolgo (Environmental) and Zaneta Encarnacion (Southeast).

The GMOC’s review is structured around three timeframes:

1. A Fiscal Year cycle to accommodate City Council review of GMOC recommendations that may have budget implications. The 2013 Annual Report focuses on Fiscal Year July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012;
2. The second half of 2012 and beginning of 2013 to identify and address pertinent issues identified during this timeframe, and to assure that the GMOC can and does respond to current events; and
3. A five-year forecast to assure that the GMOC has a future orientation. The period from January 2013 through December 2017 is assessed for potential threshold compliance concerns.

The GMOC annually distributes questionnaires to relevant city departments and public facility and service agencies to monitor the status of threshold standards compliance. When the questionnaires are completed, the GMOC reviews them and deliberates issues of compliance. They also evaluate the appropriateness of the threshold standards, whether they should be amended, and whether any new threshold standards should be considered.

1.3 GMOC 2013 Annual Review Process

The GMOC held ten meetings between October 2012 and April 2013, which were open to the public. Representatives from the city departments and public agencies associated with the threshold compliance questionnaires gave presentations to the Commission and discussed the questionnaires they had completed (attached in Appendix B). Through this process, city staff and the GMOC identified issues and recommendation, which are discussed in this report.

The final GMOC annual report is required to be transmitted through the Planning Commission to the City Council at a joint meeting scheduled for April 25, 2013.

1.4 Growth Forecast

The Development Services Department annually prepares a Five-Year Growth Forecast, the latest of which was issued in November 2012. The Forecast provides departments and outside agencies with an estimate of the maximum amount of residential growth anticipated over the next five years. Copies of the Forecast were distributed with the GMOC questionnaires to help the departments and agencies determine if their respective public facilities/services would be able to accommodate the forecasted growth. The Growth Forecast from November 2012 through December 2017 indicated an additional 9,103 residential units could be permitted for construction in the city over the next five years, (8,196 in the east and 907 units in the west), for an annual average of 1,639 in the east and 181 units in the west, or just over 1,820 housing units permitted per year on average, citywide.

The citywide average of projected units permitted per year is up 640 units from last year's forecast of 1,180 units.

1.5 Report Organization

The 2013 GMOC Annual Report is organized into four sections:

Section 1: Introduction; description of GMOC's role and review process; an explanation of the Residential Growth Forecast; and an outline of the 2013 report

Section 2: A threshold compliance summary in table format

Section 3: A threshold by threshold discussion of issues, acknowledgments, statements of concern (if any), and recommendations

Section 4: Appendices

2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

The following table indicates a summary of the GMOC's conclusions regarding threshold standards for the 2012 annual review cycle. Seven thresholds were met and four were not.

2012 THRESHOLD STANDARD – ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY				
REVIEW PERIOD 7/1/11 THROUGH 6/30/12				
Threshold	Threshold Met	Threshold Not Met	Potential of Future Non-compliance	Adopt/Fund Tactics to Achieve Compliance
1. Libraries		X	X	X
2. Police				
Priority I		X	X	X
Priority II		X	X	X
3. Traffic		X	X	X
4. Fire/EMS		X	X	X
5. Parks and Recreation				
<i>Land</i>	X		X	
<i>Facilities</i>	X		X	
6. Fiscal	X			
7. Drainage	X			
8. Schools				
CV Elementary School District	X			
Sweetwater Union High School District	X			
9. Sewer	X			
10. Air Quality	X			
11. Water	X			

3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS

3.1 LIBRARIES

Threshold Standard:

Population ratio: 500 square feet (gross) of adequately equipped and staffed library facility per 1,000 population. The city shall construct 60,000 gross square feet (GSF) of additional library space, over the June 30, 2000 GSF total, in the area east of Interstate 805 by build-out. The construction of said facilities shall be phased such that the city will not fall below the city-wide ratio of 500 GSF per 1,000 population. Library facilities are to be adequately equipped and staffed.

Threshold Finding: Non-Compliant

3.1.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard

LIBRARIES			
	Population	Total Gross Square Footage of Library Facilities	Gross Square Feet of Library Facilities Per 1000 Population
Threshold	X	X	500 Sq. Ft.
5-Year Projection (2017)	279,608	95,412	341
12-Month Projection (12/31/13)	251,563	95,412	379
FY 2011-12	249,382	92,000/95,412	369/383**
FY 2010-11	246,496	102,000/92,000*	414/387*
FY 2009-10	233,692	102,000	436
FY 2008-09	233,108	102,000	437
FY 2007-08	231,305	102,000	441
FY 2006-07	227,723	102,000	448
FY 2005-06	223,423	102,000	457
FY 2004-05	220,000	102,000	464
FY 2003-04	211,800	102,000	482
FY 2002-03	203,000	102,000	502

*After closure of Eastlake Library at Eastlake High School in June 2011

**After opening of Otay Ranch Town Center Branch Library in April 2012

Issue: The threshold standard has not been met for the ninth consecutive year.

Discussion: The gap between the threshold standard square footage and the City's actual square footage of library space continues to broaden. By the end of 2013, a deficit of 121 square feet per 1,000 population is projected.

Libraries reported that there will be insufficient staff and facilities to serve forecasted growth in the next 18 months and in five years. Construction of the Rancho del Rey branch has been indefinitely postponed due to insufficient Public Facilities Development Impact Fees (PFDIF) funding. And the Millenia (EUC) library, planned for the later phase of the project, is also several years away. Per the Millenia Development Agreement, a phasing plan for library delivery is due within one year of adoption of an updated Libraries Master Plan.

As the GMOC recommended in its 2012 Annual Report, the City Council needs to adopt an updated Library Facilities Master Plan that will identify interim and long-term solutions to the current square footage deficit. Creative resolutions and partnerships, such as the Otay Ranch Town Center Library, need to continuously be explored. In addition, partnering opportunities that will both add services to library patrons and generate revenue to offset recurring costs for new and existing libraries should be pursued.

Although an updated Master Plan was completed in 2011, the City Council postponed consideration of the document until a Library Strategic Plan could concurrently be brought to them. Funds to complete the Strategic Plan have been identified and work is scheduled to begin this spring. Upon completion, the Strategic Plan and Library Facilities Master Plan will simultaneously be brought to City Council for their consideration this summer.

Recommendation: That City Council, without further delay, adopt a Library Facilities Master Plan that provides interim and long-term solutions to bring the library system into conformance.

3.2 POLICE

Threshold Standard:

Priority 1

Emergency Response: Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 81% of the Priority 1 emergency calls throughout the city within seven minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority 1 calls of five minutes and thirty seconds (5.5 minutes) or less.

Priority 2

Urgent Response: Respond to 57% of the Priority 2 urgent calls throughout the city within seven minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority 2 calls of seven minutes and thirty seconds (7.5 minutes) or less.

Threshold Finding: Priority 1: Non-Compliant
Priority 2: Non-Compliant

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time	Average Time
Emergency Response (Priority 1)	81.0%	7 minutes	5:30 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority 2)	57.0%	7 minutes	7:30 min./sec
Actual	Percent	Time	Average Time
Emergency Response (Priority 1)	78.4%	7 minutes	5:01 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority 2)	41.9%	7 minutes	11:54 min./sec.

3.2.1 Non-Compliant Priority 1 Threshold Standard

Priority 1 – Emergency Response Calls for Service			
	Call Volume	% of Call Responses Within 7 Minutes	Average Response Time
Threshold		81.0%	5:30
FY 2011-12	726 of 64,386	78.4%	5:01
FY 2010-11	657 of 64,695	85.7%	4:40
FY 2009-10	673 of 68,145	85.1%	4:28
FY 2008-09	788 of 70,051	84.6%	4:26
FY 2007-08	1,006 of 74,192	87.9%	4:19
FY 2006-07	976 of 74,277	84.5%	4:59
FY 2005-06	1,068 of 73,075	82.3%	4:51
FY 2004-05	1,289 of 74,106	80.0%	5:11
FY 2003-04	1,322 of 71,000	82.1%	4:52
FY 2002-03	1,424 of 71,268	80.8%	4:55

Issue: The threshold standard was not met for the first time since FY 2004-05.

Discussion: During the period under review, the Police Department responded to 78.4 percent of Priority 1 – Emergency Response calls within 7 minutes, which was 2.6 percent below the threshold standard of 81 percent, and 7.3

percent below the percentage reported for the previous year. The average response time, however, was within the threshold standard. With an average response time of 5 minutes and 1 second, the response time was 29 seconds better than the threshold standard requires, but 21 seconds longer than the previous year.

The Police Department attributes the increased response times to chronically low staffing in the Community Patrol Division. However, grant funding received in 2012 may relieve the situation somewhat because it allows the department to recruit six new officers to the Patrol Division in 2013. Another 2.5 Community Service Officers will also be added.

Implementation of a hybrid patrol schedule in 2013 is also expected to have a positive effect on response times. The 4/10-3/12 schedule adds more staffing on Friday – Sunday, when call-for-service volumes are highest. Officers work a 10-hour schedule from Monday through Thursday and a 12-hour schedule Friday through Sunday.

Recommendation: That City Council support the Police Chief's efforts to 1) increase staff to budget levels, and 2) effectively manage the work schedules to improve response times.

3.2.2. Non-Compliant Priority 2 Threshold Standard

PRIORITY 2 – Urgent Response Calls for Service			
	Call Volume	% of Call Responses Within 7 Minutes	Average Response Time
Threshold		57.0%	7:30
FY 2011-2012	22,121 of 64,386	41.9%	11:54
FY 2010-11	21,500 of 64,695	49.8%	10:06
FY 2009-10	22,240 of 68,145	49.8%	9:55
FY 2008-09	22,686 of 70,051	53.5%	9:16
FY 2007-08	23,955 of 74,192	53.1%	9:18
FY 2006-07	24,407 of 74,277	43.3%	11:18
FY 2005-06	24,876 of 73,075	40.0%	12:33
FY 2004-05	24,923 of 74,106	40.5%	11:40
FY 2003-04	24,741 of 71,000	48.4%	9:50
FY 2002-03	22,871 of 71,268	50.2%	9:24

These figures do not include responses to false alarms, beginning in FY 2002-03.

Issue: The threshold standard was not met for the 15th consecutive year.

Discussion: The percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes dropped to 41.9 percent, 7.9 points lower than last year, putting it 15.1 points below the threshold standard of 57 percent. This is the largest noncompliant gap

since FY 2005-06, when 40 percent of the calls were responded to within 7 minutes.

At 11 minutes and 54 seconds, the average response time was 4 minutes and 24 seconds above the threshold standard – which was 1 minute and 48 seconds worse than last year and the worst time ever reported to the GMOC.

The Police Department reported that staffing must significantly increase in the Community Patrol Division in order to meet the Priority 2 threshold standard. “This is most likely the best that can be achieved without additional patrol personnel,” they stated. As mentioned above, the Police Department is in the process of hiring additional officers.

It should also be noted, however, that part of the non-compliance problem is the threshold standard itself. Previous GMOC annual reports explained that the City’s growth management staff and Police Department staff studied the Priority 2 threshold standard and determined that it needs to be modified to more accurately report response times. This change will be part of an amended growth management ordinance that will be brought to Council later this year as part of the Top-to-Bottom review.

Overall, the GMOC is concerned that the trend for both Priority 1 and 2 is headed in the wrong direction, and will continue to monitor these closely in future reports.

Recommendation: That City Council support the Police Chief’s efforts to 1) increase staff to budget levels, and 2) effectively manage work schedules to improve response times.

3.3 TRAFFIC

Threshold Standard:

Citywide: Maintain Level of Service (LOS) “C” or better as measured by observed average travel speed on all signalized arterial segments, except that during peak hours a LOS “D” can occur for no more than two hours of the day.

West of I-805: Those intersections which do not meet the standard above, may continue to operate at their current (year 1991) LOS, but shall not worsen.

Threshold Finding: Non-Compliant

3.3.1 Non-Compliant Threshold Standard

Issue: Two arterial segments were non-compliant with the threshold standard.

Discussion:

During the period under review, two arterial segments were non-compliant (see table below). The first, Heritage Road northbound from Olympic Parkway to Telegraph Canyon Road, was unchanged from last year, exceeding the Level of Service (LOS) threshold standard by four hours (three hours at LOS D and one hour at LOS E).

SEGMENT (Limits)	DIR	LOS 2011 (Hours)	LOS 2012 (Hours)	CHANGE
Heritage Road (Olympic Parkway to Telegraph Canyon Road)	NB	D(5) E(1) Non-Compliant	D(5) E(1) Non-Compliant	None
Otay Lakes Road (East H Street to Telegraph Canyon Road)	SB	C (2) D(4) Non-Compliant	D(6) Non-Compliant	C(-2) D(+2)

According to the City's traffic engineers, regular monitoring is necessary to bring the segment back into compliance, but "With the reduced staff, we have not been able to monitor corridor timing on a continual basis," they stated.

The second non-compliant segment was Otay Lakes Road, southbound between East H Street and Telegraph Canyon Road, which operated at LOS D for six hours, exceeding the threshold standard by four hours. To address the problem, the second phase of a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) that will widen Otay Lakes Road will commence in 2013. It encompasses the segment between Elmhurst Avenue and the intersection of Telegraph Canyon Road/La Media Road. The improvements will increase the capacity on Otay Lakes Road and improve the traffic within the area of Southwestern College.

The engineers also reported that, during the period under review, westbound Olympic Parkway from east of Brandywine Avenue to Oleander Avenue near the I-805 was operating at LOS F during the two-hour peak morning period. Because it did not operate at LOS D or worse for more than two hours, this segment was compliant with the threshold standard. However, to improve the situation, the storage length of the westbound Olympic Parkway to southbound Brandywine Avenue left turn pocket needs to be increased so that the left turning traffic does not block one of the three westbound through lanes. The City Council approved a CIP Project (TF-377), currently in the design phase, in Fiscal Year 2011/2012 to implement the improvements. The project will provide additional left-turn vehicle storage from 220 feet to 450 feet in the single westbound left-turn lane on Olympic Parkway to southbound Brandywine Avenue.

The GMOC has serious concerns regarding the chronic non-compliance of the Traffic threshold standard and the delay in constructing Heritage Road to Main Street. While it is within the GMOC's purview to request that City Council hold a public hearing to consider a moratorium on

tentative maps or building permits, due to threshold non-compliance, we understand that a moratorium would not be the solution at this time. We do believe, however, that a public workshop to discuss expansion of the City's circulation system and ongoing threshold compliance conditions is necessary so that citizens can better understand current traffic issues, forecasted conditions and roadway improvement plans.

Recommendation: That City Council continue to support City engineers in their efforts to implement improvements that will result in threshold compliance, including: 1) funding to monitor corridor timing on a continual basis, and 2) timely completion of the Otay Lakes Road widening project and the Olympic Parkway/Brandywine Avenue left turn pocket extension project.

3.3.2 Underutilization of SR-125

Issue: SR-125 continues to be underutilized.

Discussion: City engineers reported that, since SANDAG took ownership of the SR-125 toll road in December 2011 and lowered toll road fees in June 2012, ridership increased approximately 30%. However, the road is still being underutilized. The cause of underutilization needs to be examined because increasing use of SR-125 diverts the ever increasing traffic volume from East H Street, Telegraph Canyon Road and Olympic Parkway.

Recommendation: That City Council and staff work with SANDAG on incentives for Chula Vista residents to use SR-125 more frequently.

3.3.3 Construction of Heritage Road

Issue: Heritage Road needs to be extended as soon as possible.

Discussion: A recurring subject reported to the GMOC from the City's traffic engineers is that the absence of Heritage Road from Olympic Parkway to Main Street is one of the major reasons for traffic congestion on Olympic Parkway and some arterial segments. Fortunately, construction of Phase 1 (Olympic Parkway to Santa Victoria Road) is expected to begin later this year. Developers have provided a bond and improvement plans have been submitted to the City for review. While this extends Heritage part way, completion of Phase 2 is necessary to provide threshold performance relief to Olympic Parkway. Construction of Phase 2 (from Santa Victoria to Main Street) will begin after 1,276 Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs) in Otay Ranch Village 2 have received Final Map approval. Approximately 400 units are outstanding, to date,

The GMOC would also like the city to work with SANDAG and/or the City of San Diego to ensure construction of the connector from Main Street to SR-905.

Recommendation: That City Council support city engineers in their efforts to construct Heritage Road, and that the City work with SANDAG and/or the City of San Diego to ensure construction of the connector from Main Street to SR-905.

3.3.4 Grade Separation of Palomar Street/LRT Crossing

Issue: Funding is needed to complete the Palomar Street/Light Rail Trolley grade separation improvements that will improve traffic flow.

Discussion: In December 2012, the SANDAG Transportation Committee and the Board of Directors approved a Memorandum of Understanding between SANDAG and the City of Chula Vista to commence work on the environmental document for grade separating the Palomar Street Light Rail Trolley (LRT) crossing between Broadway and Interstate 5. Vehicular traffic along Palomar Street, a major east-west arterial, is increasing due to area build-out in the City's western urban areas, and the current at-grade crossing requires traffic to stop each time a train passes the crossing. As ridership and the number of trolley trips per day of the Blue Line LRT increases, the wait time will get worse. The combination of increased vehicular traffic and increased wait time behind the rail crossing arms will result in major traffic delays for vehicles at the at-grade crossing and potential non-compliance of the threshold standard. An August 2012 combined technical study report between the City and SANDAG identified the crossing as Priority 1 for improvements; however, complete funding has not been identified.

Recommendation: That City Council and staff work with SANDAG on securing complete funding for the Palomar Street/Light Rail Trolley grade separation.

3.4 FIRE and EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

Threshold Standard:

Emergency response: Properly equipped and staffed fire and medical units shall respond to calls throughout the city within seven (7) minutes in 80% (current service to be verified) of the cases (measured annually).

Threshold Finding: Non-Compliant

3.4.1

Non-Compliant Threshold Standard

FIRE/EMS - Emergency Response Times			COMPARISON	
Review Period	Call Volume	% of All Call Response w/in 7:00 Minutes	Average Response Time for 80% of Calls	Average Travel Time
THRESHOLD		80.0%		
FY 2012	11,132	76.4	5:59	3:41
FY 2011	9,916	78.1	6:46	3:41
FY 2010	10,296	85%	5:09	3:40
FY 2009	9,363	84.0%	4:46	3:33
FY 2008	9,883	86.9%	6:31	3:17
FY 2007	10,020	88.1%	6:24	3:30
CY 2006	10,390	85.2%	6:43	3:36
CY 2005	9,907	81.6%	7:05	3:31
FY 2003-04	8,420	72.9%	7:38	3:32
FY 2002-03	8,088	75.5%	7:35	3:43
FY 2001-02	7,626	69.7%	7:53	3:39
FY 2000-01	7,128	80.8%	7:02	3:18
FY 1999-00	6,654	79.7%		3:29

Note: Reporting period for FY 2001-02 and 2002-03 is for October 1, 2002 to September 30, 2003. The difference in 2004 performance when compared to 2003 is within the 2.5% range of expected yearly variation and not statistically significant.

Issue: The threshold standard has not been met for the second consecutive year.

Discussion: The percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes dropped nearly 2% between Fiscal Year 2011 (78.1%) and Fiscal Year 2012 (76.4). That is down a total of 8.6% in the past two years, and 3.6% below the threshold standard of 80%. The Fire Department explained that, during the reporting period, the call volume increased by 1,493 calls (10% medical and 24% fire) while available resources, staffing and facilities remained the same. This resulted in a higher demand on available resources and made the standard increasingly difficult to meet. They indicated that the aging fleet of fire apparatus, combined with a reduction in public works support staff (radio technicians and mechanics) also hampered their ability to meet the standards.

Despite the downturn in response times, the Fire Department reported that the average response time for 80% of the calls actually improved by 47 seconds, due to the fact that the majority of the calls were on the west side of the City, where navigation through the roadways is easier. Response times in the west averaged 5.39 minutes; response times in the east averaged 6.48 minutes.

As noted above, there were 1,493 more calls for service in 2012 than in 2011 and the majority of increased calls were for fires. The percentage of

fire calls went from 5.1% in 2011 to 7.19% in 2012. The other calls in 2012 were medical (84.59%) and other emergencies (8.22%).

Recommendation: That City Council direct the Fire Department to implement effective measures that will ensure that the threshold standard will be met.

3.4.2 Fire Facilities Master Plan

Issue: Delay of a council-approved Fire Facilities Master Plan update will hinder the Finance Department's efforts to complete a comprehensive Public Facilities Development Impact Fee (PFDIF) update.

Discussion: In last year's Annual Report, the GMOC recommended expeditious completion of the Fire Facilities Master Plan approval process so the master plan could be included in the next Public Facilities Development Impact Fee (PFDIF) update. In response, the Fire Department stated that both a master plan and a fiscal analysis to accompany it had been completed, and they were working on the PowerPoint presentation for the Council and public outreach meetings.

For the 2013 Annual Report, the Fire Department reported, once again, that "The Fire Facility Master Plan is complete as is the fiscal analysis. The Fire Department is scheduling a series of public information meetings where we will share the plan with civic groups and solicit feedback prior to asking the city council to adopt the document." Since the Master Plan appears to be in a similar place as it was a year ago, the GMOC would request a defined time for completion.

Recommendation: That City Council ensure expeditious completion of the public information meetings and scheduling for Council consideration by the end of 2013 so the updated Fire Facilities Master Plan can be included in the next PFDIF update.

3.5 PARKS and RECREATION

Threshold Standard:

Population Ratio: Three acres of neighborhood and community park land with appropriate facilities per 1,000 residents east of I-805.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.5.1 Potential Non-Compliant Threshold Standard

Issue: Potential non-compliance with the threshold standard is projected by the end of the year.

Discussion: Based on population and development projections, there may be a slight shortage in park acreage by the end of 2013. Specifically, the potential project shortage of 5.2 acres would bring the park/population ratio to 2.96 acres per thousand, marginally below the threshold standard of 3 acres per 1,000 residents east of Interstate 805.

However, significant progress has been made in resolving physical issues on individual sites in Village 2, which will allow Park P-3 (6.93 acres) and the 70-acre community park to move forward, beginning with preparation of park master plans.

Parks staff reported that parks are also on the horizon for the Millenia Development as triggers in the Eastern Urban Center (EUC) Parks Agreement are met.

Recommendation: That City Council direct Parks staff to closely monitor timely preparation of individual park master plan designs and land development phasing to keep it in compliance with the threshold standard.

3.5.2 Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan

Issue: Delay of a council-approved Parks and Recreation Master Plan update will hinder the Finance Department's efforts to complete a comprehensive PFDIF update.

Discussion: As with the Libraries and Fire Master Plans, the GMOC believes that adoption of an updated Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan is a top priority. A comprehensive Public Facilities Development Impact Fee (PFDIF) update cannot be completed without the updated master plans.

A draft Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan was presented to Council in December 2011; however, Council requested additional staff analysis on the landmark park in Otay Ranch Village 2 before they considered the document. The City's current processing of land entitlements related to the University Villages portion of the Otay Ranch have resulted in the need for staff to reanalyze future park development locations and facilities, including evaluation of a landmark park. Staff anticipates returning to City Council in 2013 with an updated document.

Recommendation: That City Council support staff in their efforts to resolve issues that may affect expeditious scheduling of the citywide Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan for Council consideration by the end of 2013.

3.5.3 Revenue Generating Capital Improvements

Issue: The City needs to maximize opportunities to generate revenue for parks and expand services.

Discussion: Parks staff reported that in calendar year 2012, the City experienced a decline in gazebo rentals from a total of 4,948 in 2010 and 4,074 in 2011 to 3,053 in 2012. They explained that the decline in rentals in 2011 was largely due to budget reductions, which eliminated the Park Ranger program. This led to gazebos not being cleaned and conflicts between day users and those who had reserved sites going unresolved, which discouraged people from reserving gazebos. In Fiscal Year 2012-13, the Park Ranger was partially restored, increasing gazebo reservations. With the partial restoration of the Ranger program, Public Works is actively promoting gazebo availability to the public and facility reservations are expected to continue to increase.

Beyond gazebos, the GMOC proposes that the Recreation Department evaluate other programs and/or capital improvements that would help generate recurring revenue. The Chula Vista Golf Course, for example, generates revenue by lease of the operation to a private party with the appropriate pricing controls and oversight. Also, higher education facilities provide lease space for private businesses to bring services needed for that institution, and the state is looking to lease space to private business for rest stops, bringing greater services at these locations that otherwise would not be there.

Recommendation: That the City review opportunities for potential capital improvements that will provide new services and recreation to the community while generating revenue to offset recurring costs for new and existing parks.

3.6 FISCAL

Threshold Standards:

1. The GMOC shall be provided with an annual fiscal impact report which provides an evaluation of the impacts of growth on the City, both in terms of operations and capital improvements. This report should evaluate actual growth over the previous 12-month period, as well as projected growth over the next 12- to 18-month period, and 5- to 7-year period.
2. The GMOC shall be provided with an annual Development Impact Fee (DIF) Report, which provides an analysis of development impact fees collected and expended over the previous 12-month period.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.6.1 PFDIF Debt Service

Issue: The City does not have a debt service payment policy.

Discussion: In last year's GMOC report, the Commission recommended that a comprehensive update to the Public Facilities Development Impact Fees (PFDIF) be done as soon as possible. The update has not been done and the Commission, once again, urges the Finance Department to update the PFDIF as soon as pending facility master plans are adopted by City Council and within 120 days of Council's action on proposed unit increases associated with pending General Plan amendments in eastern Chula Vista.

Along with the update, the Commission urges the City to adopt a debt service payment policy as soon as possible. Last year, the GMOC expressed concern that the amount of PFDIF fees being used to pay debt service exceeded what was originally assumed when the PFDIF was last updated; a debt service payment policy could potentially establish standards to prevent that from occurring.

According to the Finance Department, a debt service payment policy is in development, and will be presented to the City Council for consideration. In regards to the PFDIF debt service issue, they explained that bond covenants for the individual debt issuances detail the terms of the obligation. When the comprehensive fee update is processed, unanticipated financing costs will be included in the calculation of the various DIF fees. During the interim between comprehensive updates, the PFDIF is subject to annual inflationary increases. The inflationary updates implemented to date in the PFDIF program are anticipated to fully cover additional financing costs incurred since the last comprehensive update of the program. The next comprehensive PFDIF program update will consider all program cost increases, including increases to construction estimates for existing projects, addition of new construction projects and additional financing costs.

Recommendation: That City Council direct the Finance Department to continue the process of comprehensively updating the Public Facilities Development Improvement Fees (PFDIF) so that it will be completed within 120 days of Council's action on proposed unit increases, and that Council adopt a debt service payment policy as soon as possible.

3.7 DRAINAGE

Threshold Standards:

1. Storm water flows and volumes shall not exceed city engineering standards as set forth in the subdivision manual adopted by city council Resolution No. 11175 on February 23, 1983, as may be amended from time to time.
2. The GMOC shall annually review the performance of the city's storm drain system to determine its ability to meet the goals and objectives above.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.7.1 Maintenance of Existing Drainage Channels

Issue: Adequate funding for channel maintenance is an ongoing problem.

Discussion: As noted in last year's annual report, the GMOC recognizes that the City's challenge to maintain existing channels is not a direct result of growth. However, there is inadequate funding, staffing levels and resources to address citywide storm drain infrastructures that require structural maintenance or replacement, routine weed abatement, and silt and debris removal to maintain channel and detention basin capacity. The City is mandated to fulfill state requirements from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board), which are about to become more stringent with the reissuance of the City's NPDES Municipal Permit.

Additional funds and resources will be necessary for the City to implement the new regulations within 18 months of the reissued permit. Staff will prepare cost estimates for Fiscal Year 2013-2014 and subsequent fiscal years during the next permit cycle.

Recommendation: That City Council direct engineering staff to closely monitor the status of channel maintenance to ensure sufficient operation and continued threshold standard compliance.

Recommendation: That City Council identify funding to implement state mandated storm water flow regulations designed to avoid potential flooding and/or health issues.

3.8 SCHOOLS

Threshold Standard:

The city shall annually provide the two local school districts with a 12- to 18-month development forecast and request an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth. The districts' replies should address the following:

1. Amount of current capacity now used or committed;
2. Ability to absorb forecasted growth in affected facilities;
3. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities;
4. Other relevant information the district(s) desire(s) to communicate to the city and the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC).

The growth forecast and school district response letters shall be provided to the GMOC for inclusion in its review.

Threshold Finding: CVESD – Compliant
SUHSD – Compliant

3.8.1 School Districts Updates

Issue: None.

Discussion: Both Chula Vista Elementary School District and Sweetwater Union High School District reported that they have adequate facilities to accommodate students for the next 18 months. However, additional facilities may be necessary within five years in the Sweetwater Union High School District. Summaries of the schools are below:

Chula Vista Elementary School District

A K-6 school in Otay Ranch Village 11 will be opening in July. With the addition of this school, the district expects to have adequate facilities to house all projected students for the next five years.

Currently, several schools in eastern Chula Vista are over capacity, including Arroyo Vista, Hedenkamp, Veterans, McMillin, Wolf Canyon, and Salt Creek, which has the highest number (89). The Learning Community in western Chula Vista is also over capacity (25) and is projected to be 154 over capacity in five years, along with Mueller (58).

Sweetwater Union High School District

The Sweetwater Union High School District reported that the unstable economy, high foreclosure rate, and expansion of charter schools into the 7-12 arena make the 5-year projections for eastern Chula Vista very tentative. If charter schools continue to siphon students, it is likely that the District will have capacity for five years of residential growth. However, if there is a significant increase in development and re-occupation of foreclosed homes, construction of Middle School No. 12 and High School No. 14 at Hunte Parkway and Eastlake Parkway may be necessary within the next 5 years.

Recommendation: None.

3.9 SEWER

Threshold Standards:

1. Sewage flows and volumes shall not exceed City Engineering Standards as set forth in the subdivision manual adopted by city council Resolution No. 11175 on February 12, 1983, as may be amended from time to time.
2. The city shall annually provide the San Diego Metropolitan Sewer Authority with a 12- to 18-month development forecast and request confirmation that the projection is within the city's purchased capacity rights and an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth, or the city engineering department staff shall gather the necessary data. The information provided to the GMOC shall include the following:

- a. Amount of current capacity now used or committed;
- b. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecasted growth;
- c. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities;
- d. Other relevant information.

The growth forecast and authority response letters shall be provided to the GMOC for inclusion in its review.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.9.1 Long-Term Treatment Capacity

Sewage Flow and Treatment Capacity					
Million Gallons per Day (MGD)	FY 10/11	FY 11/12	18-month Projection	5-year Projection	"Build-out" Projection*
Average Flow	16.272	15.935	16.853**	17.948**	26.2*
Capacity	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864	20.864

*Buildout Projection based on 2005 Chula Vista Wastewater Master Plan

**Growth rate per the "Residential Growth Forecast Years 2012 through 2016"

Issue: None.

Discussion: Once again, Sewer is in compliance with the threshold standard and is projected to remain in compliance for the next ten years. As the city begins to approach build-out projections, however, additional treatment capacity will need to be obtained. Staff is working on updating the 2005 Master Plan in order to verify the build-out treatment capacity needs of the City. Two "cost per gallon" options for acquiring additional treatment capacity are being considered: 1) Constructing a sewer treatment facility in Chula Vista; or 2) Purchasing additional treatment capacity rights from other agencies within the San Diego Metropolitan System.

Recommendation: None.

3.10 AIR QUALITY

Threshold Standard:

The GMOC shall be provided with an Annual Report which:

1. Provides an overview and evaluation of local development projects approved during the prior year to determine to what extent they implemented measures designed to foster air

- quality improvement pursuant to relevant regional and local air quality improvement strategies.
2. Identifies whether the city's development regulations, policies, and procedures relate to, and/are consistent with current, applicable federal, state, and regional air quality regulations and programs.
 3. Identifies non-development related activities being undertaken by the city toward compliance with relevant federal, state, and local regulations regarding air quality, and whether the city has achieved compliance.

The city shall provide a copy of said report to the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) for review and comment. In addition, the APCD shall report on overall regional and local air quality conditions, the status of regional air quality improvement implementation efforts under the Regional Air Quality Strategy and related federal and state programs, and the effect of those efforts/programs on the city of Chula Vista and local planning and development activities.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.10.1 Threshold Compliance

Issue: None.

Discussion: During the period under review, the Chula Vista's development standards met and/or exceeded regional, state, and federal air quality regulations. At a regional level, the number of unhealthy air quality days for older adults and children in San Diego County decreased from 19 to 13 from 2010 to 2011, which is significantly lower than neighboring regions, and San Diego County met federal ozone emission standards for the first time in 2012.

A summary of the City's accomplishments can be found in the Air Quality questionnaire (Appendix B).

Recommendation: None.

3.11 WATER

Threshold Standards:

1. Developer will request and deliver to the city a service availability letter from the water district for each project.
2. The city shall annually provide the San Diego County Water Authority, the Sweetwater Authority, and the Otay Municipal Water District with a 12- to 18-month development forecast and request evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth. The districts' replies should address the following:

- a. Water availability to the city and planning area, considering both short- and long-term perspectives;
- b. Amount of current capacity, including storage capacity, now used or committed;
- c. Ability of affected facilities to absorb forecast growth;
- d. Evaluation of funding and site availability for projected new facilities;
- e. Other relevant information the district(s) desire to communicate to the city and GMOC.

Threshold Finding: Compliant

3.11.1 Meeting Water Demands

Issue: None.

Discussion: Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority serve the City of Chula Vista, and both reported that they will be able to meet the water demands of anticipated growth over the next five years. Specific data is available in the Otay Water District and Sweetwater Authority questionnaires, located in Appendix B of this report.

Otay Water District

The Otay Water District (OWD) has developed, and annually reviews, its Water Resources Master Plan (WRMP), which relies on growth projection data provided by SANDAG, the City of Chula Vista, and the development community; it serves as a guide to reevaluate the best alternatives for providing reliable water system facilities. Integral to the annual review process is ensuring that capital improvement program projects are funded and constructed in a timely manner, and verifying that they correspond with development construction activities and water demand growth that require new or upgraded facilities.

Service reliability levels have been enhanced with the addition of major facilities that provide access to existing storage reservoirs and increase supply capacity from the Helix Water District Levy Water Treatment Plant, the City of San Diego South Bay Water Reclamation Plant, and the City of San Diego Otay Water Treatment Plant.

The Otay Water District, in concert with the City of Chula Vista, also continues to expand the use of recycled water. The Otay Water District continues to actively require the development of recycled water facilities and related demand generation within new development projects within the City of Chula Vista.

Sweetwater Authority

The Sweetwater Authority's 2010 Water Facilities Master Plan lists estimated costs and almost all proposed projects, including several maintenance and upgrade programs where pipelines, valves and other facilities are constantly being renewed. For example, the Perdue

Treatment plant was recently upgraded to meet new treatment standards and the desalination facility capacity may be increased. These projects allow the Authority to continue to provide service to the City in the near- and long-term.

The Sweetwater Authority closely monitors development activities within the City of Chula Vista, including the Bayfront and the urban core which will require major infrastructure coordination.

Recommendation: None.

4.0 Appendices

4.1 Appendix A – Growth Forecast

4.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires